

**CMER Meeting
June 19, 2003
NWIFC Conference Center
Minutes**

Attendees:

Butts, Sally	USFWS
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Ehinger, Bill	DOE
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Glass, Domoni	Glass Environmental
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	CMER co-chair, Martin Environmental
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McDonald, Dennis	DNR
Parks, Dave	DNR
Pavel, Joseph	NWIFC
Peterson, Pete	UCUT
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	CMER co-chair, WDFW
Robinson, Tom	WSAC
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Smitch, Curt	Thompson Consulting Group
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR
Wilkerson, Mark	?

Summary of Decisions and Tasks

Decision/Task	Section of Minutes
May CMER minutes approved	Minutes
<ul style="list-style-type: none">ISAG: Eastside Survey project report approvedRSAG: \$14,375 additional funding approved for hardwood conversion projectPSMWG; workshop request approvedPSMWG: \$8,000 approved for a technical writer	SAG Requests
<ul style="list-style-type: none">2004 Workplan development schedule approved with revisions	Workplan
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Pavel asked to gather information to address questions raised by CMER regarding possible formation a monitoring coordination group. Proposal to be considered at July meeting	Monitoring Oversight

Minutes and Action Items: Minutes from the May CMER meeting were approved as amended. Action Items were reviewed.

SAG Requests:

ISAG: ISAG requested approval of the final report for the 2002 eastside survey project. The SAG received no substantive review comments on this draft. The data was compiled without much interpretation and no SRC review was required for the study design or final report. Process checkpoints leading to final report approval need to be standardized.

CMER Consensus: The report was approved as submitted.

RSAG: RSAG requested \$14,375 for the Hardwood Conversion Project to be added to \$375,000 previously approved. RSAG would like to reallocate \$1,500 from the unused portion of \$375,000. RSAG proposes that the other funding come through the project development funds. Since both sources of money have already been approved by the FPB, they will not need to be approached with this reallocation. The SAG has an opportunity to do additional stream temperature monitoring using WDFW (Mark Hunter). RSAG is proposing to change the contract and place WDFW in the lead role for the temperature study. RSAG will purchase equipment which will be CMER's to use in the future; housing for the equipment has not been worked out yet. WDFW and WDOE have expressed concerns about stream temperature since the project started.

CMER Consensus: This project funding request was approved as submitted.

PSMWG: The Protocols and Standards Manual Work group requested a CMER workshop or afternoon science session to focus on fundamental issues and manual assembly. The group wants to ensure that they are capturing the intent of FFR and meetings the needs of CMER. The current handbook draft will be e-mailed to CMER and detailed review is not requested at this time. The PSMWG will continue work on the handbook following guidance from CMER during a July 17th afternoon session. A full draft of Chapter 6 – *Project Management* was distributed at the meeting.

CMER Consensus: Guidance will be provided to the PSMWG during the afternoon of July 17th.

PSMWG 2: The PSMWG requested \$8000 additional funding for a technical writer to help complete the Manual draft. This is critical for efficient and timely development of the manual and allows for full-time employment of a technical writer through September 2003. The group requests that funds come from the project development fund – there will be \$23,600 remaining in the fund if this funding request is approved.

CMER Consensus: This request was approved as submitted.

SRC Update: The University of Washington informed the DNR that technical reviewers who were previously scheduled to conduct a review were no longer available because the document was not submitted on time. CMER needs to have better communication between the SAGs, the AMPA and the University regarding review dates and specialist needs. The contract has been finalized and the overall process with CMER is good. ISAG may have a water typing model report ready for review in October.

Rule Tools: The LHZ study will be managed by DNR Geology starting in July. The regional unstable landforms project may be handled by DNR Geology as well depending on agency contracting capabilities. Sturhan asked for guidance from CMER regarding what type of information is desired for the rule tool updates. DNR management of rule tools provides a checks and balance system where SAGs develop science and DNR handles implementation/management and staffing.

2004 Workplan: Doug Martin thanked Dave Schuett-Hames for writing the 2003 workplan and thanked WFPA for assisting with the formatting. A handout was provided outlining a task list designed to result in completion of the 2004 workplan and submission to the FPB for approval at their November 12th regular meeting. CMER participants suggested adding an October 2nd verbal report to FFR policy to provide a heads-up on CMER progress. Pavel reminded CMER that he had agreed to revisit reorganization of the project prioritization issue. There was also a request for consistent use of project and program names per the listing in the workplan– this is critical to tracking and transparency.

SAG Issues:

UPSAG: Type N Demarcation study. Jim MacCracken and Allen Pleus said that most of the reviewers have submitted comments, but the review committee had not met with Bob yet. Review committee members, at CMER, agreed that no revisions should be made until after the committee meets to discuss the report. The earliest date where all members of the review committee can meet is in late July.

- ISAG Dennis McDonald said that data collection is steadily moving forward and we have a water typing model developed. The eastside model is forecasted for completion by March 2005.
- LWAG: Jim MacCracken said that specimen storage is a problem for the RMZ resample and LWAG may submit a request to buy a freezer in the near future.
- SAGE: Pete Peterson said that SAGE may be requesting use of project development funds at the July CMER meeting.
- UPSAG2: UPSAG is having contractor problems and is still trying to resolve how to proceed with the severing the contract in full from items completed to date. There is general concern about committee management of individual contractors and UPSAG recognizes that we need to be careful as we do not want to lose contractor interest in bidding because of the current problems associated with contractors. Sturhan

reminded CMER that a workshop would be useful to help CMER deal with contractors. Clear objectives, tasks and deliverables along with ability to get contractors to fulfill obligations are suggested topics for the training.

Monitoring Oversight: Joseph Pavel initiated discussion of a CMER monitoring oversight committee. The MAG has been inactive and the Monitoring Design Team was asked to develop a report outlining FFR monitoring needs. This report has been completed but is still in draft form. Pavel is suggesting a possible monitoring oversight committee to guide finalization of the MDT and guide evaluation of cumulative effects and watershed analysis. The proposed committee could also provide monitoring oversight of individual SAGs as it relates to effectiveness and extensive monitoring. A connection with the statewide Monitoring Oversight Committee to help guide intensive monitoring is suggested. The proposed committee could also provide guidance and coordination between CMER needs and DNR compliance monitoring. The MDT needs to be rechartered by CMER if further work is to be done on the report as the past charter has expired. The proposal is not a concrete structure; it is a conceptual model to explore CMER needs as they relate to monitoring efforts.

CMER participants had questions and comments as follows: clarification of CMER role vs. SAG roles and responsibilities is needed; clarification of why MAG is needed given evolution of CMER and the workplan; clarification of DNR/CMER compliance relationship and who leads committee; CMER needs more detail on how proponents view MAG roles/relationships; this is not a question of whether CMER needs to manage, but whether the effort is more than CMER can handle as a larger group; and what level is the new group – above SAGs, same as SAGs, below SAGs.

CMER Consensus: Pavel group was asked to gather more information to address CMER questions. CMER would like to discuss the proposal during the July meeting.

MDT Status Update: Bill Ehinger said that there is agreement within the MDT group that a final document is needed. Some minor editing would make the current Draft MDT a good conceptual document. After completion, the MDT report will be submitted to Policy, who originally requested the report.

Next Meeting: The next CMER meeting is scheduled for July 17th. Agenda items, in addition to regular items, will include a compliance monitoring update, a workplan schedule update and possible further discussion or action on the Monitoring Oversight Committee proposal.

Adjourned for Lunch

Bull Trout Overlay and Shade Temperature Study Status Report: Butts said that the BTO and shade temperature study is looking at differences between standard FFR riparian prescriptions and the additional prescriptions afforded to bull trout areas. The study also measures temperature through shade, water and air indicators. It also looks at the all shade rule to see if it really captures all available shade. Within the study sites, there will be 1,000 feet of stream treated with standard or overlay prescriptions and an additional 1,000 above that will serve as a reference area. Buffers above the reference points will be maintained somewhat to ensure no significant upstream effects. Approximately two years of pretreatment data will be gathered then treatment will occur followed by at least two years of post-treatment observation.

Butts distributed a summary outlining where BTSAG is today. Please contact Butts or Jackson for a copy.

Questions have arisen regarding study design and logistics/implementation. Butts reviewed those concerns and how BTSAG has addressed those concerns. This information is also available in the status report. Quinn said that site selection is between 10 and 25 percent of the cost of doing the work so SAGs should be sure to budget that into the cost and timeline up front. Quinn also thanked Jackson and Butts for their work getting these study sites together as well as their work on the general study design and implementation.

Integration of Extensive Monitoring and SAG Workplans: Quinn said that there was a meeting with RSAG; they are planning a large scale type n/f effectiveness study and also have an extensive temperature study in the works. Coordination between RSAG and LWAG and a meeting was held to discuss possible integration. Following the meeting, LWAG met to discuss the integration and determined that the amphibian study will not fit well with the RSAG studies.

Clark suggested that there could also be a hillslope component to the type N study. A meeting between RSAG and UPSAG was suggested to discuss possible linkages.

Pucci suggested a possible brainstorming session to identify other integration possibilities. Many CMER participants also suggested that coordination will work better for intensive monitoring than it does for extensive or effectiveness monitoring.

SAG extensive monitoring needs:

- LWAG does not yet have an extensive monitoring plan.
- RSAG has a project scheduled out on the horizon for type N temperature. RSAG will also conduct extensive monitoring on water quality parameters and riparian stand conditions; they worked from the MDT to develop the concept.
- BTSAG may need to look at sediment and temperature monitoring over the long term as well as fish populations.
- WETSAG has two needs: 1) road fill in wetlands on a subwatershed basis and 2) reforestation requirements.

- UPSAG will conduct extensive monitoring on roads and has a study plan almost ready for CMER review. There is a separate plan for mass wasting and BMP effectiveness. There is also an RMAP effectiveness study planned. There will be extensive monitoring for landslides as well.
- ISAG will conduct extensive monitoring for fish passage and will use the MDT example for the study.

Butts said that some SAGs are moving along at a good pace and others are not. If there are some SAGs that are not as far along, would a group, such as the one proposed by Pavel, be able to help these SAGs get farther along with this? Coordination among compliance, effectiveness, intensive and extensive monitoring will be important.

Intensive monitoring Update: Ehinger said that there was a salmon recovery index watershed monitoring program being implemented by the state. This has now been unfunded by the state and is funded by the SRF Board instead. The SRF Board has agreed to fund the program through July 03 and expects an assessment of the program before further funding will be awarded. Interested stakeholders have been working to conduct the assessment. They have found that intensive monitoring is consistent among programs and funding for the program is critical. The group is asking to continue smolt monitoring and for funding to pull together the WSA data and collect data where there is none. This data will then be reviewed to develop hypotheses and study plans that could result in studies. Rowe suggested that landowners in the potential basins be contacted as soon as possible and before funding is approved.